



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| 10/565,831 | 01/25/2006 | Junya Toguchida | Q92863 | 6132 |
| 65565 | 7590 | 06/12/2009 | EXAMINER | |
| SUGHRUE-265550 | | | | FRAZIER, BARBARA S |
| 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVE. NW | | ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER |
| WASHINGTON, DC 20037-3213 | | 1611 | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 06/12/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/565,831 | TOGUCHIDA, JUNYA | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | BARBARA FRAZIER | 1611 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) BARBARA FRAZIER. (3) Sejal Rathod.
 (2) Ryan Cady. (4) Sharmila Landau.

Date of Interview: 09 June 2009.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 11,20-28,35 and 36.

Identification of prior art discussed: Paralkar (EP 1205189), Tani et al (Bio. Med. Chem., 10, pp.1107-1114, 2002), Fortier et al (J. Bone Joint Surg., 84-B, pp. 276-288, 2002).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants asked if changing the claim language from "consisting essentially of" to "composed of" would overcome the rejection. Examiner responded that "composed of" would be construed as "consisting essentially of", absent a showing from the specification that "composed of" should be construed differently. Applicants will consider remarks in their next response.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/B. F./
 Examiner, Art Unit 1611

/Sharmila Gollamudi Landau/
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1611